

# United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO.   | FILING DATE     | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.     | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|-----------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 09/769,665  | 01/24/2001      | Mikael Berner        | BVOCP009                | 5409             |
| 28875   | 7590 12/12/2005 |                      | EXAMINER                |                  |
| Zilka-Kotab, PC<br>P.O. BOX 721120<br>SAN JOSE, CA 95172-1120 |                 |                      | PIERRE, MYRIAM          |                  |
|   |                 |                      | ART UNIT                | PAPER NUMBER     |
| ,   |                 |                      | 2654                    |                  |
|   |                 |                      | DATE MAILED: 12/12/2005 |                  |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

|  | Application No.  | Applicant(s)  |  |  |  |  |  |
|--|--|---|--|--|--|--|--|
| Office Action Summer   | 09/769,665   | BERNER ET AL.   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Office Action Summary  | Examiner   | Art Unit  |  |  |  |  |  |
| •  | Myriam Pierre  | 2654  |  |  |  |  |  |
| The MAILING DATE of this communication app<br>Period for Reply   | ears on the cover sheet with the c   | orrespondence address   |  |  |  |  |  |
| A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA  - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.  - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w  - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). | TE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 6(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim ill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE | l.  lely filed  the mailing date of this communication.  (35 U.S.C. § 133). |  |  |  |  |  |
| Status   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 30 No   | ovember 2004.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| · _ · ·  | action is non-final.   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <i>;</i> —   | ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| closed in accordance with the practice under E.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Disposition of Claims  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,5,6 and 19-30</u> is/are pending in the application.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1,5-6,19-30</u> is/are rejected.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 7)⊠ Claim(s) <u>28</u> is/are objected to.   | · _ · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| · <u> </u>   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ,  | election requirement.  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Papers   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).</li> <li>a) All b) Some * c) None of:</li> <li>1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.</li> <li>2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No</li> </ul>   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| <ul> <li>3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).</li> </ul>  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.   |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| ·  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attachment(s)  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) Interview Summary   |   |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) B) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)   | Paper No(s)/Mail Da<br>5) Notice of Informal P   | ate<br>atent Application (PTO-152)  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date  | 6)  Other:   | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·                                       |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |   |  |  |  |  |  |

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

## Response to Arguments

1. Applicant's arguments with respect to claim1, 5-6, 19-30 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1,5-6, and 19-22 and 28-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakisaka et al. (referred as Wakisaka) (6,112,174) in view of Lewis (5,170,164).

As to claims 1, 28-9 and 30, Wakisaka teach

A method, system and computer readable medium for providing localized content (col. 3 lines 56-58), comprising:

receiving from a user a content utterance representative of content (col. 3 lines 65-67 and col. 4 lines 1-3)

determining a current location of the user (col. 6 lines 60-63; GPS);

wherein the current location is determined utilizing a current location speech recognition process (Fig. 5)

wherein voice-enabled driving directions are provided by:

receiving a destination address utterance representative of a destination address (col. 6 lines 60-63 and lines 33-47);

determining an origin address (col. 6 lines 33-47);

querying a driving direction database (GPS system) for generating driving directions based on the destination address and the origin address (col. 4 lines 26-30)

wherein multiple databases are utilized in carrying out the address speech recognition process including a first database (dictionary 1) with a plurality of city names and zip codes (col. 1 lines 1-15 and col. 6 lines 27-37 and Fig. 1 element 104; city names and zip code information is inherent in PDA navigation system), and a second database (dictionary 2 or Fig. 1 element 105) with a plurality of city names and associated zip codes, and a second database (dictionary 2) with a plurality of street names, where a third database is used for validation purposes (col. 5 lines 14-38, col. 6 lines 27-37 and Abstract; RAM dictionary is used to validate or to recognize speech, if speech isn't validated or recognized in the current RAM dictionary, the dictionary is switched to DICTIONARY CHANGE-VER INFORMATION)

wherein a probability is assigned to at least one aspect of at least one of a plurality of grammars which indicates a prevalency of use of the at least one aspect, the probability being determined using statistical data, and the probability being used during at least one of the speech recognition processes (col. 5 lines 57-65 and col. 6 lines 1-14; number of words are measured against the area using a scale to find the best represented area for the word).

Wakisaka does not teach querying and transcribing a content database.

However, Lewis transcribing the content utterance representative of content (col. 7 lines 56-67).

Art Unit: 2654

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the

invention to implement transcribing utterance of content in feature location data of Lewis to the

recognition dictionary system for car navigation of Wakisaka, because Lewis teaches that this

will produce a map or record that includes custom feather descriptions and automatically capture

feature location information, col. 7 lines 55-67.

As to claim 5, which depends on claim 1, Wakisaka teach wherein the current location is

determined by a source of the content utterance (col. 6 lines 8-15).

As to claim 6, which depends on claim 1, Wakisaka teach wherein the content utterance

is received, and the content database queried utilizing an inherent network (col. 6 lines 59-63;

GPS comprises a global network of satellites that interact with a controller attached to a GPS

received).

As to claim 19, which depends on claim 1, Wakisaka teach wherein the origin address is

determined utilizing the address speech recognition process (col. 6 lines 8-15).

As to claim 20, which depends on claim 1, Wakisaka teach wherein the address speech

recognition process includes querying the driving direction database on the origin address (col. 5

lines 26-37).

As to claim 21, which depends on claim 20, Wakisaka teach wherein the driving direction database queried by the address speech recognition process includes grammars representative of addresses local to the origin address (col. 6 lines 8-15).

Page 5

As to claim 22, which depends on claim 21, Wakisaka teach wherein the addresses include street (intersection) names (col. 6 lines 34-38)

As to claim 26, which depends on claim 1, Wakisaka teach wherein at least on of the speech recognition processes uses heterogeneous protocols by:

dynamically retrieving grammars utilizing protocols based on the type of the database (Fig. 1 element 103 and col. 5 lines 14-26).

As to claim 27, which depends on claim 1, Wakisaka teach wherein at least one speech recognition process uses heterogeneous protocols by:

determining whether the grammars are retrieved from a first database during a first attempt (col. 6 lines 27-37; dictionary 1);

retrieving the grammars from a second one of the databases upon the failure of the first grammar (col. 6 lines 27-37; dictionary 2)

4. Claims 23-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Wakisaka et al. (referred as Wakisaka) (6,112,174) in view of Lewis (5,170,164), as applied to claim 1, in further view of Kennedy III (6,167,255).

As to claim 23, which depends on claim 1, Neither Wakisaka nor Lewis teach the method of voice-enabled flight information.

However, Kennedy III teach receiving flight utterance representative of a flight identifier (voice recognition Fig. 3 element 62c and Fig. 6 travel services element 32e)

transcribing the flight utterance utilizing a flight utterance speech recognition process (voice recognition Fig. 3 element 62c and Fig. 6 travel services element 32e; necessary in the recognition process to transcribe flight utterances in order for the system to display text to the user) and,

querying a flight information database for generating flight information based on the flight identifier (Fig. 3 element 62c and Fig. 6 travel services element 32e).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement Kennedy III data communication into transcribing utterance of content in feature location data of Lewis and car navigation of Wakisaka, because Kennedy III teaches that this will produce local functions normally performed by call centers, col. 8 lines 59-63.

As to claim 24, which depends on claim 23, Neither Wakisaka nor Lewis teach wherein the flight information includes a time of arrival of the flight.

However, Kennedy III teach flight information includes a time of arrival of the flight (Fig. 3 element 62c and Fig. 6 travel services element 32e).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement Kennedy III data communication into transcribing utterance of content in feature location data of Lewis and car navigation of Wakisaka, because Kennedy III teaches that this will produce local functions normally performed by call centers, col. 8 lines 59-63.

As to claim 25, which depends on claim 23, Neither Wakisaka nor Lewis teach wherein the flight information includes a flight number.

However, Kennedy III teach the flight information includes a flight number (Fig. 3 element 62c and Fig. 6 travel services element 32e).

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to implement Kennedy III data communication into transcribing utterance of content in feature location data of Lewis and car navigation of Wakisaka, because Kennedy III teaches that this will produce local functions normally performed by call centers, col. 8 lines 59-63.

### Conclusion

5. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Application/Control Number: 09/769,665 Page 8

Art Unit: 2654

however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Myriam Pierre whose telephone number is 571-272-7611. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30-5:30.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Richemond Dorvil can be reached on 571-272-7602. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

MP 12/07/2005

ANGELA ARMSTRONG
PRIMARY EXAMINED